



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/734,764	12/11/2003	William Kress Bodin	AUS920030835US1	1941

70426 7590 06/23/2011  
IBM AUSTIN IPLAW (DG)  
C/O DELIZIO GILLIAM, PLLC  
15201 MASON ROAD, SUITE 1000-312  
CYPRESS, TX 77433

EXAMINER
----------

PATEL, MANGLESH M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2178

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-------------------	---------------

06/23/2011

ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

USPTO@DELIZIOGILLIAM.COM  
USPTO2@DELIZIOGILLIAM.COM



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

Commissioner for Patents  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS  
AND INTERFERENCES**

Application Number: 10/734,764  
Filing Date: December 11, 2003  
Appellant(s): BODIN ET AL.

---

Rodney L. Lacy  
For Appellant

**EXAMINER'S ANSWER**

This is in response to the appeal brief filed 4/13/2011 appealing from the Office action mailed 12/9/2010.

**(1) Real Party in Interest**

The examiner has no comment on the statement, or lack of statement, identifying by name the real party in interest in the brief.

**(2) Related Appeals and Interferences**

The following are the related appeals, interferences, and judicial proceedings known to the examiner which may be related to, directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal:

**The decision rendered by the board on this application on January 28, 2010, affirming the rejection of claims 1-24 on the same art.**

**(3) Status of Claims**

The following is a list of claims that are rejected and pending in the application:  
Claims 1-24.

**(4) Status of Amendments After Final**

The examiner has no comment on the appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief.

**(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter**

The examiner has no comment on the summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief.

**(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal**

The examiner has no comment on the appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal. Every ground of rejection set forth in the Office action from which the appeal is taken (as modified by any advisory

actions) is being maintained by the examiner except for the grounds of rejection (if any) listed under the subheading "WITHDRAWN REJECTIONS." New grounds of rejection (if any) are provided under the subheading "NEW GROUNDS OF REJECTION."

**(7) Claims Appendix**

The examiner has no comment on the copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the appellant's brief.

**(8) Evidence Relied Upon**

**5,748,186**

**Raman**

**05-1998**

**U.S. Pub 2003/0023435 A1, Josephson, 01-2003**

**(9) Grounds of Rejection**

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

1. Claims 1-7, 9-15, and 17-23 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Raman (U.S. Patent 5,748,186), issued May 5, 1998 [hereinafter "Raman"].

Regarding **Independent claim 1**, Raman teaches:

*A method for creating a presentation document, the method comprising:  
creating, in dependence upon an original document, a structured  
document comprising one or more structural elements; and*

Art Unit: 2178

(See, Raman, col. 2, lines 18-35. See also, Raman, col. 3, lines 6-11, teaching retrieving a document and converting the information to a “common intermediate representation” with a structure of the information.)

*creating a presentation grammar for the structured document, wherein the presentation grammar for the structured document comprises a data structure that includes grammar elements each of which includes a presentation action identifier, a key phrase for invoking a presentation action a structural element identifier for at least one structural element of the structured document and a parameter type to be used in parsing the received speech, wherein the parameter type identifies a type of a parameter, wherein the parameter is received from a user after the key phrase and controls presentation control instruction corresponding to the presentation action that is invoked by the user speaking the key phrase.*

(See, Raman, col. 6, lines 29-31, teaching that control signals can include recognized speech, which inherently includes a grammar to be recognized. Further, see, Raman, claims 14 and 22, teaching interactivity of the system accomplished using only speech.

**See column 4, lines 10-30 “In addition, the presentation can momentarily pause on the links so that the user can select the link using a voice input unit” further stating “...interact with the forms using speech”, Raman therefore discloses a parameter type to be used in parsing the received speech, for example the received speech is parsed and then the parameter type identifies a link for selection or a parameter type identifies a form component for selection and**

**display.**

Regarding **dependent claim 2**, Raman teaches:

*The method of claim 1 wherein creating a structured document further comprises inserting in the structured document structural element identifiers for the structural elements.*

(See, Raman, Col. 5, lines 21-32, teaching changing structural element identifiers, rendering methods, to accommodate different renderings. The various changed identifiers amounting to differing styles for the structured document.)

Regarding **dependent claim 3**, Raman teaches:

*The method of claim 1 wherein creating a structured document further comprises converting existing structural element identifiers from the original document to structural element identifiers for the structural elements of the structured document.*

(See, Raman, col. 2, lines 18-34, and col. 3, line 6 through col. 4, line 76, teaching receiving original documents, e.g.: rendered in HTML, which is a structured document language, and parsing the data to a structured hierarchical attributed tree. See also, Raman, figure 3, element 330 identifying <title> and element 361 identifying <p> for paragraph.)

Regarding **dependent claim 4**, Raman teaches:

*The method of claim 1 wherein creating a presentation grammar for the structured document comprises:*

*identifying the content type of the original document;*

(It is noted that “identifying the content type of the original document” is disclosed as follows: “identifying the content type may be carried out by identifying the content type in dependence upon a filename extension. In other embodiments, identifying the content type is carried out by identifying the content type in dependence upon document header elements.” See, disclosure, page `3, lines 17-21.

See, Raman, col. 5, lines 47-56, teaching retrieval, recognition, and presentation of an HTML document, as an example of the invention. See also, Raman, col. 3, lines 6-8, teaching a “recognizer 130” coupled to the receiver 120, to convert information 11 into a common intermediate high-level logical data structure 200, the recognizer must inherently identify and know the content type of the original document in order to process it. See also, Raman, figure 3, element 330 identifying <title> and element 361 identifying <p> for paragraph.)

*selecting, in dependence upon the content type, a full presentation*

*grammar from among a multiplicity of full presentation grammars; and*

(See, Raman, col. 3, lines 8-20, teaching, for example, presentation of aural information by a speech synthesizer, monitor, Braille and by animated cartoon. See also, Raman, col. 3, lines 30-34, teaching the use of a voice input speech recognizer to control the presenter of the content types.)

*filtering the full presentation grammar into a presentation grammar for the structured document in dependence upon the structural elements of the structured document.*

(It is noted that filtering the full presentation grammar includes writing from the full presentation grammar to the presentation grammar for the structured document each grammar element having a structural element identifier of a structural element that occurs in the structured document. Applicants' disclosure, page 3 lines 23-26.

See, Raman, col. 2, lines 36-45, teaching the use of "control signals" as "presentation grammar" to control the modality being used to control the presentation. See, Raman, col. 6, lines 30-33, teaching that a control signal may include recognized speech as an input. See, also Raman, col. 3, lines 30-34, teaching that the data retriever and the presenter of the system may be controlled by voice recognized input couple to a speech recognizer. And see, Raman, col. 5, lines 38-46, teaching "navigational methods associated with objects allow the user to browse through the text by taking into consideration the underlying structure of the document." And see, Raman, claim 1, lines 13-15, teaching "presenting the common intermediate representation using a plurality of user communication modalities according to the hierarchical attribute trees." And see, Raman, col. 4, lines 22-27, teaching speech response to aural presentation of stock data. For each type of speech response, it is inherent that there be an associated grammar.)

Regarding **dependent claim 5**, Raman teaches:



*The method of claim 4 wherein identifying the content type comprises identifying the content type in dependence upon a filename extension.*

(See, Raman, col. 3, lines 41-44, teaching recognizing file type by extension, i.e.: “html.” See also, Raman, col. 5, lines 47 through col. 6, line 4, teaching identification of the document by tags, such as <html>. See also, Raman, figure 3, element 330 identifying <title> and element 361 identifying <p> for paragraph.)

Regarding **dependent claim 6**, Raman teaches:

*The method of claim 4 wherein identifying the content type comprises identifying the content type in dependence upon document header elements.*

(See, Raman, col. 4, lines 38-49, teaching receiving a source document by characters encoded as text as well as marks placed in the text to define the structure, and the “recognizer” to parse the character stream into fundamental source elements, for example, title, sections, sub-sections, paragraphs, sentences, links, forms and so forth. See also, Raman, col. 5, lines 47 through col. 6, line 4, teaching identification of the document by text element tags, such as <head>, <title>, <body> and <p>.)

Regarding **dependent claim 7**, Raman teaches:

*The method of claim 4 wherein filtering the full presentation grammar comprises writing from the full presentation grammar to the presentation grammar for the structured document each grammar element having a structural element identifier of a structural element that occurs in the structured document.*

Art Unit: 2178

(See, Raman, col. 2, lines 36-45, teaching the use of “control signals” as “presentation grammar” to control the modality being used to control the presentation. See, Raman, col. 6, lines 30-33, teaching that a control signal may include recognized speech as an input. See, also Raman, col. 3, lines 30-34, teaching that the data retriever and the presenter of the system may be controlled by voice recognized input couple to a speech recognizer. And see, Raman, col. 5, lines 38-46, teaching “navigational methods associated with objects allow the user to browse through the text by taking into consideration the underlying structure of the document.” And see, Raman, claim 1, lines 13-15, teaching “presenting the common intermediate representation using a plurality of user communication modalities according to the hierarchical attribute trees.” And see, Raman, col. 4, lines 22-27, teaching speech response to aural presentation of stock data. For each type of speech response, it is inherent that there be an associated grammar.)

Regarding **claims 9-15**, claims 9-15 incorporate substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claims 1-8, respectively, and are rejected along the same rationale.

Regarding **claims 17-23**, claims 17-23 incorporate substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claims 1-8, respectively, and are rejected along the same rationale.

Art Unit: 2178

2. Claims 8, 16 and 24 remains rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Raman as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Josephson, (U.S. Patent Publication 2003/0023435 A1), published January 30, 2003 [hereinafter "Josephson"].

Regarding **dependent claim 8**, Raman in view of Josephson teaches:

*The method of claim 4 wherein the full grammar comprises a multiplicity of grammar elements for the content type, wherein each grammar element includes:*

*an identifier of a structural element;*

*a key phrase for invoking a presentation action; and*

*a presentation action identifier representing a presentation action.*

(The key phrase function is inherent in Raman, but not expressly taught. See, Raman, col. 6, lines 30-33, teaching that a control signal may include recognized speech as an input. See, also Raman, col. 3, lines 30-34, teaching that the data retriever and the presenter of the system may be controlled by voice recognized input couple to a speech recognizer. And see, Raman, col. 4, lines 22-27, teaching speech response to aural presentation of stock data. For each type of speech response, it is inherent that there be an associated grammar and for each grammar that there be an identifier of the object to be acted upon, a signal for the action, and a presentation of the action signaled. In corporation of the grammar elements in a central file or in a separate file for each media type is a design decision between art recognized equivalents, namely

Art Unit: 2178

placing controls in one or several files. In general, Raman teaches the creation of a structured document for user interaction based on attributes and classification, but it does not expressly teach a key phrase.

Josephson expressly teaches the use of a key phrase for invoking a presentation action. See, Josephson, paragraphs [0191]-[0259].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Raman and Josephson to result in a user interactive control of a structured document using a list of attributes, classifications (tags), and associated scope.

Both Raman and Josephson are related to the art of user interactions with computers to control document production, including via voice recognition commands, and both use tag, or classification, structured documents.

The suggestion or motivation for combining the references is found in Josephson, discussing the invention as an improvement to “voice-mousing” and control of “select next” type commands, which is one type of navigational control discussed in Raman. See, Josephson, paragraphs [0008]-[0010], and see, Raman, col. 7, lines 5-50.)

Regarding **claims 16 and 24**, claims 16 and 24, incorporate substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 8, and are rejected along the same rationale.

**It is noted that any citations to specific, pages, columns, lines, or figures in the prior art references and any interpretation of the references should not be**

**considered to be limiting in any way. A reference is relevant for all it contains and may be relied upon for all that it would have reasonably suggested to one having ordinary skill in the art. See, MPEP 2123.**

### **Information Disclosure Statement**

- 1. The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 1/4/2011 has been entered, and considered by the examiner.**

### **(10) Response to Argument**

(1) Appellant Argues: Neither the portion of the Final Office Action provided above, nor any other portion of the Final Office Action identifies any element in Raman that corresponds with or discloses a “presentation action identifier”, a “key phrase” a “presentation action” or a “presentation control instruction”, each of which are specifically recited in claim 1. (pg 8, paragraph 3)

Raman fails to disclose parameters received after a key phrase.  
There is no disclosure that the speech input of Raman is parsed in any way such that the speech input includes both a key phrase and a parameter received after the key phrase. In particular, Raman fails to disclose any parsing whatsoever of speech input.  
The mere fact that speech input may be used to select a link or provide input to a form in response to a prompt does not explicitly or inherently disclose or require grammar

Art Unit: 2178

elements comprising a key phrase parameter provided after the key phrase that controls a presentation control instruction that corresponds to a presentation action. (pg 8, paragraph 4 & pg 9, paragraph 1)

The Examiner respectfully disagrees: Raman discloses at:

Column 3, lines 30-35 states "...**a voice input unit coupled to a speech recognizer, and a speech synthesizer**".

Column 4, lines 10-15 states "**In addition, the presentation can momentarily pause on the links so that the user can select the link using a mouse, a keyboard, or a voice input unit.**"

Column 4, lines 20-30 states "...**the user can select to interact with the forms using speech. The system can say the prompts of the transaction, and the user input can be processed by the speech input unit of the I/O.**"

Raman teaches a "presentation action/ identifier", "key phrase" and "presentation control instruction". Raman indicates that the invention accepts user voice input to select items in a presentation such as links and forms thereby determining a presentation

action/identifier using words or speech which are key phrases processed/parsed by the speech synthesizer thereby determining a presentation control instruction of “selecting” links or “selecting to interact with forms using speech”. Although Raman doesn’t provide a listing of specific types of key phrases, Josephson is relied on for disclosing this feature. See paragraph 251 of Josephson disclosing “send an email to X” as key phrases processed by a speech content analyzer (paragraph 248).

Furthermore Raman teaches a “parameter type” which as broadly defined in the claims is used to refer to the piece of data that the action is performed upon such as the specific hyperlink or the text field being selected with the voice input. For example column 3, lines 55-60 states “...the links are usually words, phrases, or icons visually highlighted in a different color or font...”, a user that selects a link represented as an image icon with voice input results in; a parameter being received that specific link (image/textual) “after the key phrase” is identified and processed by the speech synthesizer.

Regarding appellant’s argument that Raman teaches nothing whatsoever of parsing speech input. As previously discussed Raman teaches a speech recognizer and a synthesizer. The steps

Art Unit: 2178

for processing spoken language into a computer format inherently includes parsing to determine a word from a plurality of spoken words. The word or collection of recognized words then being used to perform an action on a presentation.

**(11) Related Proceeding(s) Appendix**

Copies of the court or Board decision(s) identified in the Related Appeals and Interferences section of this examiner's answer are provided herein.

For the reasons above it is believed that the rejection should be sustained.

Respectfully Submitted,

/Manglesh Patel/  
Patent Examiner (AU 2178)  
6/13/2011

Conferees:

/Stephen S. Hong/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2178

/William Bashore/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2175